DOE/EH – 0649

# DynCorp Tri-Cities Services, Incorporated

## Report from the DOE Voluntary Protection Program Onsite Review, November 13-17, 2000

**U.S. Department of Energy**
Office of Environment, Safety and Health
Office of Safety and Health
Office of Regulatory Liaison

**December 2000**

DOE/EH – 0649

# DynCorp Tri-Cities Services, Incorporated

## Report from the DOE Voluntary Protection Program Onsite Review, November 13-17, 2000

**U.S. Department of Energy**
Office of Environment, Safety and Health
Office of Safety and Health
Office of Regulatory Liaison

**December 2000**

# Contents

# Abbreviations and Acronyms

| | |
|---|---|
| **AJHA** | Automated Job Hazard Analyses |
| **BASS** | Behavioral Awareness Safety Society |
| **BLS** | Bureau of Labor Statistics, U.S. Department of Labor |
| **CIH** | Certified Industrial Hygienist |
| **CSP** | Certified Safety Professional |
| **DOE** | Department of Energy |
| **DOE-RL** | Department of Energy — Richland Operations Office |
| **DOE-VPP** | Department of Energy Voluntary Protection Program |
| **DynCorp** | DynCorp Tri-Cities Services, Incorporated |
| **EH** | Office of Environment, Safety and Health |
| **ES&H** | Environment, Safety and Health |
| **FH** | Fluor Hanford |
| **HAMTC** | Hanford Atomic Metal Trades Council |
| **HAZOP** | Hazard Operability Study |
| **HEHF** | Hanford Environment Health Foundation |
| **HGET** | Hanford General Employee Training |
| **HQ** | Headquarters |
| **IIR** | Injury Incidence Rate |
| **ISM** | Integrated Safety Management |
| **ISMS** | Integrated Safety Management Systems |
| **LOTO** | Lockout/Tagout |
| **LWDI** | Lost Workday Incidence |

| | |
|---|---|
| **OSHA** | Occupational Safety and Health Administration |
| **PHMC** | Project Management Hanford Contract |
| **PPE** | Personal Protective Equipment |
| **PM** | Preventative Maintenance |
| **RCRA** | Resource Conservation and Recovery Act |
| **RCT** | Radiological Control Technician |
| **RII** | Recordable Injury Incidence |
| **RL** | Richland Operations Office (DOE) |
| **RPRA** | Respiratory Protection Program Administrator |
| **SAS** | Safeguards and Security |
| **SIC** | Standard Industrial Classification |
| **SIP** | Safety Improvement Plan |
| **S&H** | Safety and Health |
| **TMX** | Training Matrix |
| **TWA** | Time Weighted Average |
| **VPP** | Voluntary Protection Program |

# Executive Summary

An onsite review was conducted at DynCorp Tri-Cities Services, Incorporated (DynCorp), Hanford Site during the week of November 13, 2000 to determine the site's eligibility for participation in the Department of Energy's (DOE) Voluntary Protection Program (VPP). The DOE-VPP Onsite Evaluation Team consisted of Carlos Coffman, Team Leader; Rama Sastry, Assistant Team Leader; Bertha Cassingham, Walter Scott, Dan Palmer, Noble Atkins, and William Barnard

This report is based on information provided in the application; safety and health program documentation reviewed onsite; interviews with employees; and walkthrough tours of work areas at the site.

There are approximately 800 DynCorp employees at the Hanford Site. The key core team to DynCorp employee involvement in the safety and health programs and processes is the Accident Prevention Committee (APC). Formal interviews were conducted with 100 employees. Informal interviews were conducted with 40 employees. DynCorp completed Integrated Safety Management System (ISM) verification in 1999. The Annual VPP Self Assessment was completed on November 10, 2000. A review of these documents by the team indicated that DynCorp has an excellent safety program.

DynCorp is properly classified under the Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) Code 340 for fabricated metal products. DynCorp services the Hanford Site, which is located in the southeastern portion of the State of Washington, north of the city of Richland. The site covers an area of 560 square miles. DynCorp's operations are located in various areas throughout the Hanford Site.

The hazards at this site include, but are not limited to, hazards from construction-type activities, crane and rigging, confined spaces, fabrication shops, vehicle maintenance and operation, radiation zones/material, warehousing activities, environmental conditions, offices, transportation activities, emergency response activities, janitorial services, chemical and radiologically contaminated wastes and materials storage and transport, welding fumes, elevated noise levels and paints, non-ionizing radiation and ionizing radiation, and eye hazards.

The three-year injury incidence rate (IIR) and lost or restricted workday rates (LWDI) for the periods (1997-1999) are 4.4 and 1.6 respectively. The site IIR is 30 percent below and the LWDI is 35 percent below the 1998 U.S. Department of Labor's Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) national industry averages for SIC 340.

Management's attitude toward safety and health is very pro-active. Resources, cooperation, time, and total support is consistently provided to the safety and health program. Program requirements for management commitment, including clear written policy and assignments of authority and accountability of managers and supervisors, have been met. The DynCorp management's commitment is clearly evident by the effort that

has been put into the program. Management was visibly involved in all aspects of the safety and health program. Top management is committed to take the time on a regular basis to visit facilities wherever DynCorp employees are stationed/employed. In addition, involvement in the APC and other safety and health related committees, the open door policy, and attendance at craft safety meetings and ceremonies all demonstrate management's strong commitment.

The work site has provided all VPP assurances. Safety and health planning is well integrated with overall management planning. Requirements for the access to certified safety and health professionals and coverage of contract workers are met. Hazard assessment systems, including identification of uncontrolled hazards, self-inspections, routine hazard surveys, employee notification of hazards, accident investigations, preventive maintenance, and medical programs are all in place. Employees at the work site are well integrated into the safety and health program through various forms of participation. The overall DynCorp program has been in place for approximately 4 years.

## Conclusion

The DOE-VPP Onsite Evaluation Team has reached a technical conclusion that DynCorp has met the requirements for participation in the DOE-VPP.

# I. Introduction

The DOE-VPP onsite review of DynCorp in Richland, Washington, was conducted during the week of November 13, 2000. DynCorp was evaluated against the program requirements contained in U.S. Department of Energy Voluntary Protection Program, Part I: "Program Elements to determine its Success in Implementing the Five Tenets of DOE-VPP." The team consisted of a diverse cross section of individuals from the DOE Headquarters office, Richland Operations Office, and three DOE site contractor employees. See Appendix for a roster of the DOE Onsite Evaluation Team. During the review, the Onsite Evaluation Team conducted formal and interviews, and reviewed documentation.

DynCorp provides essential infrastructure support to the Hanford Site, locale of the U.S. Department of Energy's Richland Operations Office (DOE-RL). These services include facility maintenance and site services, transportation services, real estate and property management, landlord program management, fire protection and emergency response services.

# II. Program Status

**Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA)**
**200 LOG RECORDKEEPING**

A review of the OSHA 200 logs was made. The following are the total incidence and lost workday injury rates since 1997:

| YEAR | HOURS | TOTAL CASES | IIR | LWDI | LWDI RATE |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1997 | 2,022,292 | 47 | 4.6 | 15 | 1.5 |
| 1998 | 1,706,031 | 35 | 4.1 | 16 | 1.9 |
| 1999 | 1,661,318 | 37 | 4.5 | 12 | 1.4 |
| TOTAL | 5,389,641 | 119 | | 43 | |
| three-year Rate (1997-1999) | | | 4.4 | | 1.6 |
| BLS National Average for 1998 (SIC 340) | | | 14.2 | | |
| 2000 YTD through 3rd quarter | 790,245 | 20 | 4.8 | 3 | 0.8 |

The information on the OSHA 200 logs supports the information provided in the application and the company's first report of injury forms supports the data in the logs.

The Safety Specialist is responsible for the entries to the OSHA 200 log and verifies the accuracy of the records. The Safety Specialist understands the recordkeeping and reporting requirements. Based upon interviews conducted with management and employees, the logs accurately reflect the injury and illness experience at this plant.

The Company requires contract employers to maintain joint logs. There were approximately 10 subcontractor employees at the work site at the time of the team's visit. Injury or illnesses occurring to temporary employees under the direct supervision of DynCorp would be recorded on the work site's OSHA 200 log. There have been three temporary employee injuries recorded on the work site's OSHA 200 log and their injury-illness rates are included in DynCorp's rates. "WARE" data base data is Fluor's centralized database that is used by DynCorp for trending purposes. Statistical control charts using three sigma limits are applied to detect trends in the injury-illness rates.

# III. Management Leadership

## A. Management Commitment

Top management is committed to the implementation of a well-coordinated safety and health program, including establishing a clear line of communication with employees. The DynCorp President and General Manager leads and supports the Environmental Safety and Health Process, tasks other management staff with site responsibility for safety, and assigns specific responsibilities associated with each of their respective expertise.

## B. Written Program

All critical elements (Management Leadership, Employee Involvement, Worksite Analysis, Hazard Prevention Control, Safety and Health Training) and sub-elements of a basic safety and health program are a part of the site's written program. All aspects of the safety and health program are appropriate to the size of the work site and type of the industry and operations.

## C. Responsibility

DynCorp has established such a strong safety culture that both management and employees share the belief that all employees of DynCorp are both responsible and accountable for safety and health (S&H) in the workplace. The Project Management Hanford Contract (PHMC) Procedure, HNF-PRO-074, "Safety and Responsibilities," clearly outlines the rights and responsibilities of management and staff within the site safety and health program. DynCorp's S&H Policy, POL-003, states that "each level of management is required to know and understand company safety and health expectations, and is required to set a good example by always observing and implementing this policy as part of the normal work routine." DynCorp Policy POL-031 defines roles, responsibilities, and functions for safety and health for managers at all levels. Interviewed managers were very much aware that safety is their responsibility, and the environment, safety and health (ES&H) department is consulted for their assistance in resolving safety and technical issues. Managers meet monthly to discuss their safety performance. During interviews and the observation of work, it was clearly evident to the team that ownership of the program was shared and the rewards of successes or the consequences of failures were shared by all in the company.

## D. Authority and Resources

DynCorp managers have sufficient resources to carry out their S&H responsibilities. Many employees interviewed by the team indicated that safety is a top priority at DynCorp. Time allotted for safety councils, resources provided to participate in Hanford sitewide training and S&H and VPP-related activities are few examples of management commitment to provide resources. Employee interviews confirmed that resources were

sufficient to carry out their S&H responsibilities. All employees interviewed indicated that they have stop work authority and relayed examples of when they actually stopped work when they felt there was a safety hazard. The other contractors at the Hanford site provide resources to DynCorp as a part of PHMC or as part of Hanford sitewide in general. For example, Hanford Environment Health Foundation (HEHF) provides general and occupational medical services.

## E. Line Accountability

Management is committed to providing the leadership, direction, goals, training, resources, and standards to ensure all employees may perform their duties in a safe and healthful workplace. Management and employees share in the responsibility to carry out individual duties in a safe manner. Managers are held accountable for safety by performing trend analysis on incidents, with corrective disciplinary action where trends are identified. Employees are reviewed for negative safety habits and trends as verified by review of performance evaluations. All site employees are empowered with the authority to address safety concerns. The review indicated that the system utilized is effectively working. DynCorp has a formal written performance appraisal system with safety and health responsibilities as a critical element for management personnel. All site safety rules, safe work practices, and Personal Protective Equipment (PPE) requirements are adequate.

## F. Management Visibility

Top-level management at DynCorp is visible and actively participates in the S&H program. Management representation is present on the Division/Directorate APCs and DynCorp Accident Prevention Council, which are both chaired by a union represented employee. These councils meet monthly, and address issues that could not be resolved at the grassroots APC and Division/Directorate APC level, respectively. Several employee interviews verified that the General Manager actively participates in daily field visits and frequently stops and speaks with employees on a wide range of topics that often are related to safety and health issues. In addition, the DynCorp Senior VP and Deputy General Manager, along with the DynCorp Accident Prevention Council Chair, Vice President of Environment, Safety, Health and Quality (ESH&Q), Industrial Safety & Health Manager, VPP Facilitator, and VPP Coordinator attend the PHMC Presidents' Zero Accident council. Managers are held accountable for their S&H responsibilities and maintain a policy of accessibility with regards to S&H issues that arise in the workplace. DynCorp managers have established an "open door" policy to ensure that any employee at any time can express a S&H concern to any level of management. The team observed this policy through formal and informal interviews and noted that most employees did not feel the need to raise concerns above their first-tier supervisor because most concerns are most often addressed immediately.

## G. Site Orientation

The basic site orientation for employees is achieved through the completion of the Hanford General Employee Training (HGET). HGET is an interactive computer-based course that covers a wide variety of areas including occupational S&H topics, computer security, and industrial safety. Employees are tested at the end of each session and must be able to pass a course before he or she can proceed to a next session. Only upon completion of all the required topics, will the employees be given an HGET certification that is valid for 1 year. Each employee is required to take HGET yearly. In addition to HGET, employees receive facility-specific briefings based on daily work assignments. Training records and interviews showed that this program met DOE-VPP expectations.

## H. Subcontractor Programs

DynCorp has two (2) resident contractors on the site. Fluor Federal Services, provides site construction activities to DynCorp – as well as all other Hanford Site contractors – in an "exclusive" arrangement with the Site: Jantec provides land mail and package pick-up/delivery services throughout the Hanford Site: Energy Northwest provides M&TE testing and calibration services – primarily in off-Site facilities. Additionally, approximately 40 "staff augmentation" contracts are in place. The primary authority for oversight of the safety performance of the subcontractors on site rests with DynCorp line management (Buyer Technical Representative[s]) with technical assistance/compliance assurance from the DynCorp ESH&Q organization.

DynCorp requires all contractors and subcontractors to undergo a review of their safety and health programs as a major part of the pre-award/selection submittal process. The construction contractor is a DOE VPP applicant, and thus has developed and implemented a comprehensive safety and health program. The mail contractor has developed and implemented a safety and health program commensurate with the activities and risks associated with their work scope. In those infrequent instances where on-site work is required by the M&TE testing contractor, the contractor performs work under the DynCorp safety & health program requirements.

Contractor employees receive primary site orientation through HGET; activity and workplace-specific orientation and training is received through a mix of both site-sponsored courses and contractor-sponsored courses. Contract provisions require program and site audits by the contractors – with oversight performed by DynCorp. – on a graded-approach basis (e.g., weekly for construction contractor, monthly for mail contractor). Contractor entry/exit at the Site is controlled through a series of security and permit/work authorization processes. Contracts contain provisions for penalties [e.g. stop work without remuneration for safety infractions], up to termination for non-compliance. This system has been in effect for several years.

## I. Safety and Health Program Evaluation

Annual evaluations of the site are conducted as part of DynCorp's Management Assessment Program. Site assessments help to determine the adequacy, effectiveness, and compliance of programs, through documentation review, interviews, and observations. In addition to the annual evaluation, each management assessment scheduled throughout the year includes specific ISM guiding principles and VPP elements. Findings identified are prioritized as safety related issues. Corrective actions developed by a corrective action team. APCs are used for implementation of corrective actions and related continuous improvement efforts. Tracking is done through the DynCorp corrective action tracking system with a weekly senior management review of status. All critical elements in the DOE-VPP program documents are addressed in this process.

# IV. Employee Involvement

Management was very cooperative in providing the team with offices for employee interviews. The formally interviewed employees were randomly selected based on jobs and locations throughout the various units. All employees interviewed were comfortable in talking with members of the DOE-VPP Onsite Evaluation Team. Employees indicated that they understood their responsibilities in the event of emergency situations. The Team's assessment confirmed that DynCorp employees are knowledgeable about the facility's safety and health program. Safety Log books are maintained at all workstations.

Employees were knowledgeable about VPP participation, including their right to request and receive reports of inspections, accident investigations, and their results. Employees also know of their right to lodge a formal complaint. Employees are very supportive of the company's participation in VPP and feel they are fortunate to work for a company that gives special recognition to their safety and health. The employees feel that DynCorp's safety and health program is impressive and is constantly improving. Several employees hired within the past 2 years confirmed that DynCorp management and workers continuously work at improving the safety culture at the site. Many of these employees noted that this was not a common practice observed by their previous employers.

One employee stated that since they didn't want to die in order to get to heaven, due to the safety culture here, this was the next best place to be. Another employee stated that in 26 years of working various DOE sites, they had never seen this degree of employee involvement anywhere before. "Glad to be working with this group, the DynCorp management is closer to what's going on and more into safety, than any other company." "When it comes to safety improvement, there are no bottlenecks at this company." Yet another employee echoed what so many others stated repeatedly, "This is one of the safest places I have ever worked."

The employee involvement in the site's safety and health program is an integral part of the overall safety and health program. Employees participate in membership in teams and committees such as the Behavioral Awareness Safety Society, VPP Steering Committee, Continuous Quality Improvement Committee, Emergency Management Committee, Hazard Operability Study, Contingency Review Committee, Steering Committee, Controlled Evacuation Committee, Electrical Safety Committee, Safety Management Council, Incident Investigation, Incident Review Committee, Process Hazard Analysis, Management of Change, Emergency Response Teams, New/Altered Equipment Safety Audits, Pre-Startup Safety Reviews, and VPP Committee. The Safety Improvement Plan and the VPP Self Assessment completed in October/November 2000 show significant employee involvement.

Employees are knowledgeable about the VPP effort at this site through management communication and the APCs, and they see it as effective. The APCs start at the

operation component level, such as Materials Management Accident Prevention Council within the warehouse/property management grouping, the next level of council includes the chairmen and subchairs from the operational components, such as those from the materials management, transportation operations, fleet support operations, and crane & rigging accident prevention councils incorporate into the Logistics Accident Prevention Council at the department level. The councils – Engineering, ESH&Q, Quality Assurance & Corrective Action Management (QA&CAM), logistics, Fire Department, and Program Support, include a majority composition of bargaining unit personnel including chairs and co-chairs from the bargaining unit. Committee members understand their role and receive appropriate training. The frequency for committee meetings is based upon which level of committee it is, but all meet at least monthly and minutes are kept for each meeting.

# V. Worksite Analysis

Management has a clear understanding and knowledge of the hazards at this site. DynCorp's President frequently visits workspaces throughout the site and talks with workers. Methods used to determine uncontrolled hazards are the Qualitative Industrial Hygiene Exposure Assessments[1] and automated job hazards analyses (AJHA). Work level accident prevention councils (employee and management safety councils) review open safety issues by utilizing the facility Safety Log. Depending on the facility and the organization, these safety councils meet every 2 weeks or monthly. Safety issues that cannot be resolved at the lowest levels are escalated to the succeeding higher level until reaching the DynCorp President's Accident Prevention Council. Logs show that most issues are resolved within 30 days. The APCs and the facility supervisors are responsible for assuring interim controls are in place for all identified hazards until a permanent fix can be applied.

## A. Pre-use Analyses

New equipment, materials and processes are analyzed at several levels for potential hazards prior to use before purchasing. The safety management processes used include: AJHA, the authorization envelop, authorization agreements, and the fire department's Hazardous Material Information Boxes. All purchased materials are reviewed and Material Safety Data sheets (MSD) obtained. MSDs are available for all employees.

## B. Comprehensive Surveys

*Industrial Hygiene, Health Physics and Safety* – Quantitative industrial hygiene monitoring is conducted by field industrial hygienists assigned to facilities, augmented, as needed, by two industrial hygienists in the central ES&H organization. Comprehensive and updated baseline industrial hygiene monitoring data has been maintained. Industrial hygiene, injury, illness, radiation exposure, health, and medical recordkeeping at this site are of excellent quality. There are no patterns of safety and health problems indicated on the OSHA 200 log.

All potential safety, health, and environmental hazards are analyzed by an integrated work planning approach based heavily on Enhanced Work Planning precepts. This approach utilizes AJHA, which is augmented by the industrial hygiene, safety, radiation protection, and health staff. The AJHA is used to identify and perform industrial hygiene monitoring and exposure assessments, and for communicating exposure information to other DynCorp facilities and employees. Results from monitoring and surveys are maintained in the AJHAs. The AJHAs are reviewed at least annually and the monitoring data is incorporated in employee's job task analyses.

1 Apex Environmental, Inc. between November 1998 and the summer of 1999 performed a series of industrial hygiene assessments of DynCorp facilities.

All potential hazards that the DynCorp firefighters might face fighting fires across the Hanford site (including facilities operated by other Hanford contractors) are identified and controlled through the Hazardous Materials Information Box posted at each facility that contains an excess of hazardous material inventory thresholds as identified in the Uniform Fire Code. The information boxes are posted outside 152 Hanford facilities, are marked with the NFPA 704 diamond on the outside and contain a detailed hazardous materials inventory. The inventory is updated quarterly. The purchase of new listed materials in excess of code thresholds requires a permit issued by the Hanford Fire Marshall who uses the information to update the Hazardous Materials Information Box for the facility.

2 Certified Industrial Hygienists (CIH), 3 Certified Safety Professionals (CSP), and 1 Occupational Health Safety Technologist, provide comprehensive laboratory services. Results from surveys are maintained in written and/or electronic form.

## C. Self-Inspections

Various forms of self-inspections are conducted at DynCorp. Examples of self-inspections conducted at the site are: assessments, audits, surveillances, General Compliance Inspections, Field Survey/Walkthrough Inspections and Pre-occupancy Inspections. The procedure for conducting self-inspections, PHMC Procedure, HNF-PRO-076, "Safety Inspections," outlines the requirement for conducting frequent and periodic self-inspections. It also outlines manager and supervisor responsibilities in conducting the self-inspections.

The procedure for conducting self-inspections HNF-PRO-076, outlines the requirement for conducting frequent and periodic self-inspections. It also outlines managers' and supervisors' responsibilities in conducting the self-inspections. This procedure applies to all shops, offices and facilities. Employees are frequently involved in each type of inspection/assessment. Participation on inspection teams also provides employees with on-the-job training that along with formal training prepares them to for conducting any worksite inspections as safety committee members. The facility areas of the safety and housekeeping inspections to be conducted for a complete calendar year are determined in the beginning of each year, and cover all the facilities that are under DynCorp's purview. Items found during the self-inspection process are discussed during the monthly safety council meetings and are tracked to completion.

The DOE-VPP onsite team reviewed several inspection reports and found that safety inspections are conducted regularly as scheduled by the members of the safety committee. In addition, all DynCorp employees are encouraged to document non-urgent safety and health concerns they may observe or encounter through their daily activities in a Safety Logbook System. The safety logbook is reviewed frequently, once actions are identified and assigned, they are tracked and the resolution is communicated back to the originating members. The team found employees use this system and speak very highly of its usefulness and effectiveness.

## D. Routine Hazard Analyses

All DynCorp facilities are inspected annually by the facility manager, accompanied by field safety and health professionals, and the matrixed environmental service representative. These are comprehensive reviews that include a physical walkthrough of each facility, a review of procedures and records, employee interviews, and an ISM compliance review. Every employee continually monitors his or her workspace and identifies hazards, noncompliances, and suggestions for safety improvements in the facility safety log. The facility manager, health and safety personnel, and interested employees informally review the safety logbook on a very frequent basis (daily or weekly). The facility APC reviews all safety logbook entries at each committee meeting (some committees meet bi-weekly, while some meet monthly). The APC attempts to resolve safety issues as quickly as possible and tracks all entries to completion. Originators of the entry are the final closure authority after the APC determines that the solution or corrective action has been completed.

## E. Employee Reports of Hazards

A review of the written hazard reporting system indicated that the system is working very effectively. Employees at all levels of DynCorp expressed strong support for the safety log books because management pays attention to the items identified, and corrective actions are completed in a timely manner (less than 30 days for most items). Employees are kept informed with the status of their safety and health concern through direct interaction with the APC, and open, effective communication with their immediate supervisor. The APC tracks all action items to completion. A senior program director reviews and initials the safety logbooks at all facilities he visits. If corrective actions appear to lagging, he re-emphasizes the importance of acting on the safety issues quickly with the appropriate managers and supervisors. Interviews with employees indicated great satisfaction with the speed of resolution and the communication of issue status from their management.

All employees have access to Safety Logs in their work area where they can log in a safety or health concern to be addressed by an APC. Employees can also submit written or oral safety and health concerns directly to their supervisors, or through the open door policy to any management staff including the President of DynCorp. In addition, employee concern forms are available on boards throughout the facilities, and may be submitted signed or anonymously to Human Resources. Bargaining Unit personnel may also submit safety concerns to their Safety Steward. All Employees can submit their concerns to the chairman of their operating component's APC. Employees are kept informed with the status of their safety and health concern.

## F. Accident Investigations

All accidents are investigated to determine the root causes and implement corrective measures for preventing a recurrence of similar incident. Investigations are conducted as required by DynCorp's contract with FHI and in accordance with DOE Order 225.1a, Accident Investigations. The investigative team will consist of a cross-section of employees, including management and bargaining unit personnel. Trained root cause specialists are used by the team to determine root causes. All incidents are tracked in the Occurrence Reporting and Processing System (ORPS). The process supports the input and output necessary for reporting, tracking, and trending all injury and near-miss incidents. The recent fire tanker/truck rollover accident investigation process was reviewed by the team for illustrative purposes.

## G. Trend Analyses

DynCorp conducts trend analysis on data generated through the Performance Indicators program that includes ISM, fire systems operability, employee involvement, training, and conduct of operations. Trends are discussed monthly at the Executive Safety Committee. Injuries, accidents, and at-risk behavior are discussed at the regularly scheduled APC meetings.

## H. Radiation Protection

DynCorp Radiological Control Technicians (RCTs) can and do work under some of the Hanford site procedures (HNF-PRSs). They also do most of their work under DynCorp specific procedures that are broken down into 5 categories, each of which are graded to the difficulty and frequency of the given task. The 5 categories and an example of the type of procedure is as follows:

Administration Procedures: Ap-DRC-005 rev. 1, "Risk Screening for Radiological Work."

Plans: PLN-DRC-001 rev. 0, "DynCorp Radcon Health Physics Technician Training Plan."

Standard Operating Procedures: SOP-0640, rev. 2/C, "Radiological Control ALARA Program."

Technical Procedures: TP-DRC-005 rev. 0, "Environmental Soil Sampling."

Work Activity Instructions: WAI-RC-009, "High Volume Air Sampling Operations."

While all of the DynCorp procedures met all requirements in the site wide procedures and the HNF-5173 PHMC Radiological Control Manual, the DynCorp specific procedures were more directed to the unique circumstances that might be encountered by DynCorp's RCTs in the performance of their duties. One unique feature of DynCorp's SOP-0640

was a DynCorp Radiological Control Job Screening Form which stated that the DynCorp Radiological Control Organization must screen any work activity on the Hanford Site that involved “disturbing the soil” (including digging and excavation) anywhere on the site.

Overall, the DynCorp Radiation Protection program is well laid out and staffed by an excellent group of people and more than meets the criteria of “protecting the workers, the public, and the environment.”

# VI. Hazard Prevention and Control

## A. Access to Certified Professional Expertise

The site has 6 full-time employees on the Environmental, Safety, and Health staff. The corporate safety and health staff is comprised of 3 CSPs and 2 CIHs and 1 Occupational Health Safety Technologist.

## B. Methods of Hazard Prevention & Control

Hazards are controlled by a variety of engineering controls, PPE, and work practice guidelines. These controls are reviewed and updated infrequently as they are well characterized. All site safety rules, safe work practices, and PPE requirements are adequate.

> *Engineering Controls* – Engineering controls are the preferred method for eliminating/ minimizing employee exposure to hazards. These methods include the use of machine guarding, ventilation controls, mechanical lifting equipment, etc.
>
> *Administrative Controls* – The type of work being conducted at this site does (or does not) warrant/utilize administrative controls that entail time rotation or other exposure control strategies. Other administrative controls at this site are discussed below.
>
> *Safety and Health Rules* – Written safety and health rules have been established and are made available to all employees after they have been instructed on their contents. These rules include the appropriate selection of needed PPE.

*Personal Protective Equipment* — A workplace assessment for appropriate PPE has been accomplished. Required equipment includes safety shoes, safety glasses with side shields, hearing protection, hard hats, and respirators. Appropriate written programs are in place for respiratory protection, hearing conservation, and exposure to hazards. Respirator fit testing is being conducted.

## C. Positive Reinforcement

Employees interviewed provided excellent examples of positive reinforcement received from supervisors or higher levels of management for safe work practices. Safety committee employees are very involved in the positive reinforcement program and consistently provide personal reinforcement and motivation for safety due to their exemplary individual commitment to safety.

Safety committee employees are very involved in the positive reinforcement program and consistently provide personal reinforcement and motivation for safety due to their exemplary individual commitment to safety. The program centers on monthly gift certificate awards to formally recognize individuals who go "above and beyond" their normal daily responsibilities to promote safety. The program encourages employees to intervene directly with coworkers to avoid unsafe acts and to correct potential safety hazards, both at work and away. The employee's peers make nominations for the safety awards. An employee is selected for recognition at each Protection Technology Hanford (PTH) safety council meeting. In addition, especially noteworthy safety acts are selected from the nominations for special recognition and gifts.

**D. Disciplinary System**

DynCorp has adopted the Flour Hanford disciplinary system for enforcing company rules. The Standards of Conduct, which apply to all DynCorp employees, define a disciplinary policy that is both objective in content and progressive with respect to modifying inappropriate behavior through its reprimand structure. Deliberate violation of established safety, radiation control, or configuration control standards is considered inexcusable and may result in immediate discharge. Disorderly conduct, or conduct that endangers the safety of employees or equipment (including playing pranks) may result in three days off without pay. The second act of misconduct may result in discharge. Failure to report a personal injury to supervision on the day it occurs may result in a reprimand for the first offense, and three days off without pay for a subsequent offense.

Standards of Conduct and progressive discipline are described in the PHMC procedure HNF-PRO-033, titled "Employee Discipline." Employees are made aware of these standards during new employee orientations and via the Hanford intranet.

During the employee interviews, employees were asked if there was a copy of the Hanford Site "Master Safety Rules" posted in their work areas. With the exception of two work groups, the "Master Safety Rules" was conspicuously posted in their workplace, or the lunchroom area where they reported for work each day. Most DynCorp employees, including all that did not have the Hanford Site "Master Safety Rules" posted in their workplaces, had a smaller laminated copy that they carried with them in the field.

All interviewed employees were familiar with the "Master Safety Rules" and adhered to them rigorously. All employees stated that to the best of their knowledge, DynCorp used a "graded" disciplinary approach for employees who disobeyed site safety rules (i.e., discipline handed down from DynCorp management depended on the severity of the offense, and whether it was a first time offense or a repeat problem).

Employees are aware that failure to follow safety rules could result in disciplinary action and, in fact, employees cited specific examples where other employees including management had been disciplined up to and including dismissal for failure to accept change necessary to create an acceptable safety culture. The disciplinary system equally applies to both employees and management.

## E. Preventive/Predictive Maintenance

The DynCorp procedure governing these activities is M-M-00.55 entitled "Preventive Maintenance & Calibration" (PM&C). The purpose of this procedure is to establish and implement appropriate periodic preventive maintenance and calibration activities that promote the prudent, safe and cost effective use of equipment. This procedure applies to PM&C activities related to equipment and instrumentation managed by DynCorp Engineering Directorate and PM&C activities performed by the DynCorp Engineering Directorate for equipment and instrumentation owned by other Hanford Site contractors. It implements the requirements of the Hanford Site Procedure HNF-PRO-490 for calibrated instrumentation. Appendix 1 of M-M-00.55 states that the default maintenance applied to equipment is "run to failure". Though it goes on to state that a run to failure maintenance plan may be appropriate in many cases, however, in some cases run to failure may be unacceptable from a safety, regulatory, operations or cost standpoint. For PMs established by DynCorp, PM&C activities should be selected so that they satisfy the following criteria:

- Safety: The PM&C enhances safety
- Regulations: The PM&C is needed to satisfy regulations and customer (DOE) requirements

Or

- The PM&C improves cost effectiveness through enhanced availability, increased reliability, reduced downtime, enhanced operating characteristics, etc.

M-M-0055 states that MAXIMO (the data base used for tracking preventive maintenance actions) needs to be populated with the data needed to extract this information (i.e., corrective maintenance actions need to be distinguished from preventive maintenance actions, equipment items consistently identified along with manufacturer, model, and system for each equipment item).

## F. Emergency Preparedness/Emergency Response

Each building emergency director performs annual emergency drills for evacuation and take cover as appropriate to ensure all employees are involved are knowledgeable of actions required during an actual emergency. The drills consist of Hanford Fire Department and affected personnel. Fluor Hanford has the responsibility for emergency planning. Dyncorp, in addition to joint efforts with Fluor Hanford, conducts its own drills to ensure preparedness of emergency responders. In addition, each of Dyncorp's building directors develops their own Emergency and Evacuation Plans, as well as Contingency Plans, where required by the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) for waste storage areas. Employees interviewed were aware of, and familiar with, the emergency program and all procedures. The plan also includes procedures for severe weather. The company has been exceptionally progressive in providing updated safety features in new equipment for emergency responders, including an intercom communication system for response vehicles that should be benchmarked by fire

departments nationwide. The Hanford Fire Department members receive annual training and participate in quarterly drills as well as actual responses. Actual responses this year included an extensive wildland fire with implementation of numerous Memorandums of Understanding (MOUs) and extensive external public attention – their performance was exemplary, and DynCorp's support of personnel was considered unprecedented in safety support.

## G. Medical Program

The site and DynCorp personnel are served by the DOE contract with Hanford Environmental Health Foundation for performance of annual medical surveillance, audiometric examinations, and pulmonary function testing. In addition to the DOE contract provided services, DynCorp has contracted medical services through another Tri-Cities firm to provide additional ergonomic worksite evaluations, a back injury prevention program, and an employee work stress prevention program. Emergency transportation is provided by the Hanford Fire Department, which is managed by DynCorp. The Hanford Fire Department is staffed by multiple paramedics around the clock for full advanced cardiac life support ambulance care, as well as a full battalion-force fire department for fire response, industrial rescue, and haz/mat/rad response. Medical protocols are based on the county medical protocol system, and approved by contract with an emergency medical director.

## H. Tracking Systems

Hazard tracking systems provide documented hazard information and data used in making management decisions, prioritizing action, establishment of goals, identifying trends, and communicating lessons learned.

# VII. Safety and Health Training

*Program Description* – Formal safety and health training begins with employee orientation. The initial Hanford General Employee Training (HGET) orientation is approximately four (4) hours long, with job- and workplace-specific orientation being conducted by the DynCorp supervisor or training coordinator. Employees requiring formal certification/qualification receive more extensive training. Training includes PPE, Respiratory, emergency evacuation, hazard communication, and hearing conservation. Hazard awareness and employee protection are strongly emphasized in part due to the extreme consequences of some activities (e.g. hoisting and rigging in tank farms). Training is conducted primarily at the HAMMER and Hanford Technical Training Centers. The frequency of refresher training is conducted on a basis in compliance with DOE and Federal standards, and commensurate with risks associated with the activities. Training is specified by position task, and tracked by a database that is used site-wide. Training programs are being reviewed and updated regularly. On-the-job training (OJT) and on-the-job experience (OJE) – often provided by employees – programs are in place and fully operational. Testing is conducted for formal training; employee feedback to improve/modify training is routinely requested, and has been used in modifying courses where appropriate (e.g. Building Emergency Director training was increased from 4 to 6 hours – too much, in too little time). Document reviews and employee interviews confirm training is being carried out systematically and thoroughly.

*Employees* – Employees understand the hazards of their job roles as well as the use of appropriate PPE required. Shop and other high-hazard areas of the work site require the use of PPE – such as safety glasses with side shields, steel toed shoes, hearing protection, or hard hats. Employees understand why PPE is necessary, what its limitations are, and how to maintain them properly. Employee interviews and review of documents revealed that activity-specific and OSHA-mandated training is being conducted as required.

*Supervisors* – Supervisors receive the same training as those they supervise. In addition, supervisors are trained to recognize the hazards of the site, assess effects on employees, and how to plan for conducting work activities safely (e.g., hazardous waste worker-supervisor, asbestos worker-supervisor). Also, supervisors (and managers) are trained in concerns resolution, drug-free workplace/substance abuse identification, and conflict resolution. Based on interviews and onsite observations, DynCorp supervisors clearly understand and carry out their safety and health role. Supervisors are responsible for ensuring that employees under their control receive all training required and that training is documented on training records.

*Emergencies* – DynCorp employees receive safety and health training initially and annually, including training on bomb threats, emergency situations from fire, chemical releases, and natural disasters. Supervisors reinforce emergency preparedness periodically through safety meetings, job hazard analysis reviews, pre-job meetings, etc.

*Managers* – Managers understand their safety and health responsibilities, and know how to effectively carry them out. Although managers receive training similar to supervisors, managers usually receive safety and health training on a higher level, usually informally in staff and leadership team gatherings; examples include contract management, employee concerns resolution, safety leadership/management, conduct of operations, diversity, ethics, and affirmative action.

*Safety Meetings* – Employees attend safety meetings regularly at DynCorp; weekly and monthly for crafts/supervision, at least quarterly for non-craft administrative/support personnel.

# VIII. General Assessment

## A. Safety and Health Condition

The DOE-VPP preliminary review and onsite review teams conducted a number of walkarounds, both as a group and individually, and conducted one hundred forty interviews of personnel. The consensus of the team was that the site was well maintained and no major safety and health issues were observed.

## B. Safety and Health Programs

The DOE-VPP team found the DynCorp S&H program to be highly effective with complete employee-management buy in. DynCorp employees indicated to several team members that there has been an increase in employee participation in the safety and health programs, and that management remains committed to keeping DynCorp a safe place to work.

# IX. Team Conclusions

The team was able to reach a consensus opinion that the applicant meets all technical requirements for participation in the DOE-VPP. The team did not identify any specific goals for further enhancements to the DynCorp Safety and Health Program.

# Appendix: DOE-VPP Onsite Review Team for DynCorp Tri-Cities Services, Inc.

| NAME | ORGANIZATION | AREAS OF RESPONSIBILITY |
|---|---|---|
| Carlos Coffman | Team Leader, DOE HQ EH- 51 | Management Leadership |
| Rama Sastry | Assistant Team Leader, DOE HQ EH-51 | Injury Illness Data<br>Worksite Analysis |
| Walter Scott | DOE Office of River Protection | Worksite Analysis |
| Noble Atkins | DOE Richland Operations Office | Management Leadership |
| Bertha Cassingham | Westinghouse WIPP Site | Program Evaluation<br>Emergency Preparedness<br>Medical Programs |
| Dan Palmer | Flour Hanford Federal Services | Planning<br>Contract Workers<br>Safety and Health Training |
| William Bernard | Protection Technology Hanford | Hazard Prevention and Control |